

## REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 11-16 and 20-25 are pending in this application for the Examiner's review and consideration. Claim 1 was amended to recite that each of the various layers of the multilayer stack have a specific thickness range. Specifically, claim 1 was amended to recite that the multilayer stack comprises a first high index multilayer having a thickness ranging from about 18 nm to about 22 nm, a low refractive index layer having a thickness ranging from about 32 to 38 nm, and a second high index layer having a thickness ranging from about 105 nm to about 125 nm (*See, e.g.*, Specification, page 9, lines 15-24). Claim 11 was amended to have proper antecedent basis. Claims 12 and 13 were amended to more clearly recite the invention (*See, e.g.*, Specification, page 4, lines 1-5). Claim 16 was also amended to more clearly recite the invention (*See, e.g.*, Specification, page 4, lines 12-13). No new matter has been added so entry of the amendment at this time is warranted.

Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are distinguished over the references cited by the Examiner in the Office Action mailed on January 28, 2003 for all of the reasons recited in the amendment filed on May 28, 2003. Claim 1, however, was amended to further distinguish the invention from the disclosure of U.S. Patent No. 5,073,451 to Iida et al. ("Iida"). Specifically, claim 1 was amended to recite specific thicknesses for each of the layers of the antireflection coating (*See, e.g.*, Specification, page 9, lines 15-24). There is no disclosure or suggestion in Iida of a multilayer stack having the specific range of thickness for each of the layers recited in claim 1, as amended. Indeed, Iida only discloses using much thicker layers (*See, e.g.*, Iida, column 7, lines 24-26) and teaches that thinner layers, such as presently claimed, are ineffective at reducing reflection (*See, e.g.*, Iida, column 7, lines 29-31). Applicants, however, have unexpectedly discovered that, contrary to the teachings of the prior art (as exemplified by Iida), a multilayer stack, such as recited in claim 1, wherein each layer has the recited thickness, can reduce the  $R_i$  for visible light to a value of less than 1% (*See, e.g.*, Specification, page 14, lines 17-21). There is absolutely no disclosure or suggestion in Iida of a multilayer stack having the claimed thicknesses for each layer or the unexpected results that would result from such a stack, *i.e.*, that the  $R_i$  for visible light could be reduced to a value of less than 1%. Indeed, as noted above, Iida teaches away from a multilayer stack having the claimed thicknesses for each layer of the stack. In fact, each of the examples disclosed in Iida, *i.e.*, examples 15-21, all have a thicknesses that is greater than the claimed thicknesses and all have an  $R_i$  greater than 1. Clearly, Iida provides no reasonable expectation that making a multilayer stack of alternating high refractive index and low refractive index layers, having the claimed thicknesses for each layer, would provide a an antireflection coating wherein the  $R_i$  for visible light is less than 1%. Accordingly, Iida can not render the pending claims obvious.

CONCLUSIONS

Applicants believe that all pending claims are now in condition for allowance, early notice of which would be appreciated. Should the Examiner not agree with this position, a personal or telephone interview is respectfully requested to discuss any remaining issues in an effort to expeditiously advance the application to allowance.

No fee is believed to be due for this submission. Should any fees be due, please charge the required fees to Pennie & Edmonds LLP Deposit Account No. 16-1150.

Date July 24, 2003

Respectfully submitted,



Paul E. Dietze (Reg. No. 45,627)

For: Victor N. Balancia (Reg. No. 31,231)

PENNIE & EDMONDS LLP  
1667 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20006  
(202) 496-4400

Enclosure